

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

DEC. 10 2007

SCOTT & YALLERY-ARTHUR
7306 Georgia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012
(202) 882-5770

Date December 10, 2007 Page 1 of 7

SEND TO: NAME: R. Chin

FIRM: U. S. Patents and Trademark Office

FAX: (571) 273-2300 PHONE: (703) 308-1613

SENT BY: NAME: Nigel L. Scott, Esquire
S&Y-A FAX: (202) 722-0040

SUBJECT: Amendment to Application No. 09/912,692

COMMENTS: _____

ORIGINAL WILL: Follow Via Mail
Follow Via Messenger
Follow Via Overnight

This fax is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee named above, and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this fax, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this fax is strictly prohibited.

If you received this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original fax to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. We will reimburse any costs you incur in notifying us and returning the fax to us.

RECEIVED**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

002/008

DEC 10 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Patent Application of Edward T. Buford, III

Serial No: 09/912,692

Group Art Unit:

Filed: 7/26/2001

Examiner: R. Chin

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20321

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED MAY 24, 2007

This is in response to the Office Action mailed May 24, 2007 the communication dated August 28, 2007, the notice of noncompliance dated September 24, 2007 and the notice mailed November 26, 2007. Applicant has removed the text from claims 1 through 16 and claim 18, as required by 37CFR 1.121 (c) (4) and the

In the May 24, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19 for obviousness based upon 35 U. S. C. 103 (a). For the record, it should be noted that the Examiner had previously allowed these claims. Specifically, the rejection was based upon the assertion that the referenced claims were unpatentable over Stewart 2,876,477 which teaches a brush having a groove or flute along its longitudinal axis, thus it is demonstrably similar to the grooved bristle described by applicant in his invention. The Examiner supports his rejection by reference to Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Stewart.

Applicant begs to differ with the Examiner's rationale for the rejection. In particular, Applicant asserts that the groove of his invention is dissimilar to the physical characteristics of Stewart. Further, Stewart does not claim the functional attributes of Applicant's groove with respect to his invention. Stewart does not make any reference

in his specification or claims to results achieved from the structural elements of the invention. Essentially, Stewart demonstrates a technique for efficient placement of the bristles in "tuft-receiving holes" such that the apices of the cross-section of the bristles are adjacent to each. The effect, if any, that such a placement will have on cleaning, particularly the ability of the apices of the bristles to act as cleaning devices is not mentioned or left to speculation.

Moreover, the arrangement of the bristles as described by Stewart virtually precludes the apices from having any cleaning function since the apices are adjacent to each other and not exposed. Further, unlike the bristle of Applicant's invention that has a single groove along the longitudinal axis and is designed so that the entire length of the bristle is a cleaning device, the polygonal shape of Stewart's bristles does not lend itself to a cleansing function. Consequently, applicant asserts that the differences between the Stewart bristic and the bristle of the invention are not merely functional.

However, Applicant has amended Claims 17 and 19 as suggested by the Examiner. The suggestions have been adopted because they accentuate the differences between Applicant's invention and Stewart, supra. Thus the description of the groove is such that it is clearly an indentation within the circumference and along the longitudinal axis of the bristle.

The status identifiers to claims 17 and 19 are changed to reflect the amendments to these claims. In Claims 17 at line 2 and 19 at line 3, the word --said-- is inserted before the words "substantially rigid bristles." In addition, in Claim 17 at the end of line 5 after the words "one groove along" and continuing on line 6 the words -- and within the

circumference of -- have been added. In line 11 after "said groove" the words --within its circumference -- are added.

Further, Claim 19, line 2, the phrase, "as claimed in Claim 17" is deleted and in line 7; the words "constant number of bristles" are deleted and the words -- at least ten bristles -- inserted in their place. On line 7, after the words "one spiral groove" the words -- within the circumference of -- before the words "the longitudinal axis." Line 12 between the words "said groove" and "said shaft" the word [on] is deleted and the words -- within the circumference -- inserted.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsiders and reexamines claims 17 and 19, as amended. These amendments were made with a view to overcoming the Examiner's rejection of the referenced claims. Applicant believes that the amendment to the claims is consistent with the Examiner's suggestions.

Applicant hereby submits new claims 20 and 21 for examination. The new claims are specifically written to include at least one spiral groove within the uniform diameter encompassing the longitudinal axis of the bristle.

In the Office Action dated August 28, 2007 Applicant was advised that claims 17 and 19 should be noted as "currently amended." Applicant has amended the Amendment to correct the designation of claims as required. In addition, the text of the canceled claims 1 - 16 and 18 is now omitted from the Amendment and all claims are listed in numerical order. Applicant believes that the Amendment is now in conformity with the rules.

Accordingly, the application will be amended as follows: